arXiv:hep-th/0307140v1 15 Jul 2003

New Mexico Tech

(July 15, 2003)

Matrix General Relativity: A New Look at Old Problems

Ivan G. Avramidi

Department of Mathematics
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
Socorro, NM 87801, USA
E-mail: iavramid@nmt.edu

We develop a novel approach to gravity that we call 'matrix general relativity' (MGR) or 'gravitational chromodynamics' (GCD or GQCD for quantum version). Gravity is described in this approach not by one Riemannian metric (i.e. a symmetric two-tensor field) but by a multiplet of such fields, or by a matrix-valued symmetric two-tensor field that satisfies certain conditions. We define the matrix extensions of standard constructions of differential geometry including connections and curvatures, and finally, an invariant functional of the new field that reduces to the standard Einstein action functional in the commutative (diagonal) case. Our main idea is the analogy with Yang-Mills theory (QCD and Standard Model). We call the new degrees of freedom of gravity associated with the matrix structure 'gravitational color' or simply 'gravicolor' and introduce a new gauge symmetry associated with this degree of freedom. As in the Standard Model there are two possibilities. First of all, it is possible that at high energies (say at Planckian scale) this symmetry is exact (symmetric phase), but at low energies it is badly broken, so that one tensor field remains massless (and gives general relativity) and the other ones become massive with the masses of Planckian scale. Second possibilty is that the additional degrees of freedom of gravitational field are confined within the Planckian scale. What one sees at large distances are singlets (invariants) of the new gauge symmetry.

1 Introduction

Gravity is one of the most universal physical phenomena in Nature. At the same time it is also one of the most challenging problems in theoretical physics. In the Newtonian mechanics all gravitational phenomena are described by one scalar field (gravitational potential) subject to the Poisson equation. Einstein, when started to think about the nature of space and time, soon realized that it is impossible to develop a consistent relativistic theory of gravity with a scalar field and one needs a symmetric two-tensor field (which can be interpreted as the Riemannian metric of the space-time) subject to what is now called Einstein equations [1]. Nowadays, Einstein General Relativity is accepted as a correct theory of gravitational phenomena at huge range of scales, from cosmological to the subatomic ones. In spite of the fact that General Relativity successfully describes all classical phenomena (with, maybe, few exceptions like singularities, dark matter, etc), so far it withstands all attempts to quantize it. In other words, we still do not have a consistent theory of quantum gravitational phenomena, that is phenomena at very small length scales (or high energies). It is expected that the general relativistic description of gravity, and, as the result, of the space-time, is inadequate at short distances. One needs new ideas to modify or to deform General Relativity. There are many different proposals how to do this (string theory [2], noncommutative geometry [3], loop gravity [4] etc) but none proved to be the right one so far. An appealing idea is that all these approaches will be somehow related within one big unifying picture called M-theory [3].

In this paper we start from the very beginning and carefully analyze the origin of the standard geometric interpretation of gravity. We show how this differential-geometric language can be generalized so that standard general relativity appears in a special commutative (or diagonal) limit. We propose that gravity should be described not by one two-tensor field but by a *multiplet of tensor fields* (or by a matrix valued two-tensor field) with the corresponding gauge symmetry incorporated in the model. Our approach should be contrasted with the "noncommutative extensions of gravity" on non-commutative spaces [5, 6, 7, 8]; it is also different from the model studied in [9].

2 Origin of Riemannian Geometry

Let us recall the origin of Riemannian geometry. As a matter of fact its roots are in the theory of linear second-order partial differential equations of mathematical physics that describe wave propagation, in particular, light.

Let M be a n-dimensional manifold without boundary. Our construction will be purely local, so it does not depend upon whether or not M is compact or noncompact. Let x denote points of M. We will be working in a small neighbourhood of a fixed point, say the origin, that can be covered by a single system of local coordinates x^μ, $(\mu = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1)$.

Let $f \in C^\infty(M)$ be a real-valued smooth function on M (a source field) and let us consider an equation

$$L\varphi = f\,, \tag{1}$$

where φ is an unknown function, and $L : C^\infty(M) \to C^\infty(M)$ is a linear second-order partial differential operator with real smooth coefficients of the form

$$L = a^{\mu\nu}(x)\partial_\mu\partial_\nu + b^\mu(x)\partial_\mu + c(x)\,. \tag{2}$$

Most importantly, it is required that the matrix $a^{\mu\nu} \in C^\infty(M)$ is a real smooth symmetric nondegenerate matrix, i.e. for any $x \in M$

$$a^{\mu\nu}(x) = a^{\nu\mu}(x)\,, \tag{3}$$

$$\det a^{\mu\nu}(x) \neq 0\,. \tag{4}$$

The determinant of the matrix a is a smooth function over M that does not change sign; it is either strictly positive of strictly negative. Since the matrix a is symmetric it has real eigenvalues. Let n_+ and n_- be the numbers of positive and negative eigenvalues of the matrix a (we assumed that there are no zero modes). Since $a(x)$ is a smooth matrix valued function, the numbers n_+ and n_- must be constant throughout the whole manifold, i.e. the signature of the matrix a is constant. This is because for an eigenvalue to change sign it must go through zero, but this would make the matrix degenerate. So, if the matrix is non-degenerate at every point and smooth, then the eigenvalues cannot change sign, and the number of positive and negative eigenvalues cannot change, i.e. they are stable.

If $n_- = 0$, i.e. the matrix a is positive definite with the signature $(+\cdots+)$, then the operator L is *elliptic*. Elliptic equations describe problems

in potential theory. All coordinates are physically of the same type, they are 'space coordinates' and M is the physical space.

If $n_- = 1$ then the matrix a has signature $(- + \cdots +)$ and the operator L is *hyperbolic*. Then there is one coordinate that is very different from the others. This is the coordinate along the negative eigenvector of the matrix a, and it is called 'time coordinate', $t = x^0$, versus 'space coordinates', x^i, $(i = 1, \ldots, n-1)$. Hyperbolic equations describe propagation of waves. In this case the manifold M is called the *spacetime*. One usually assumes that the spacetime M has the following topological structure $M = \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$, where Σ is a manifold (compact or noncompact) without boundary (a time slice of M). Since we are concerned only with local questions such topological issues will not play any role.

Further, we note that under the smooth diffeomorphisms

$$x'^{\mu} = x'^{\mu}(x)\,,$$

the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$ transforms according to

$$a'^{\mu\nu}(x') = \frac{\partial x'^{\mu}}{\partial x^{\alpha}} \frac{\partial x'^{\nu}}{\partial x^{\beta}} a^{\alpha\beta}(x)\,, \tag{5}$$

which is exactly the transformation law of the components of a contravariant two-tensor of type $(2,0)$, i.e. a section of the bundle $TM \otimes TM$. This can be used to transform a hyperbolic operator L to the following canonical form

$$L = -\partial_t^2 + a^{ij}(t,x)\partial_i\partial_j + b^0(t,x)\partial_t + b^i(t,x)\partial_i + c(t,x)\,. \tag{6}$$

Important information is provided by the *characteristics* of a hyperbolic equation: they define the wave fronts that serve to describe the connection between waves and particles (geometric optics). They are also needed to find the short wave asympotics of the solutions of hyperbolic equations. The characteristics are a family of the level curves $S(x) = C$ of the solution of the *Hamilton-Jacobi equation*

$$a^{\mu\nu}(x)(\partial_\mu S)(\partial_\nu S) = 0\,. \tag{7}$$

This equation is closely connected with the Hamiltonian system (x, ξ) with the Hamiltonian

$$H(x,\xi) = a^{\mu\nu}(x)\xi_\mu\xi_\nu\,, \tag{8}$$

which leads to the *Hamiltonian equations*

$$\frac{dx^\mu}{dt} = 2a^{\mu\nu}(x)\xi_\nu \tag{9}$$

$$\frac{d\xi_\mu}{dt} = -\partial_\mu a^{\alpha\beta}(x)\xi_\alpha\xi_\beta\,. \tag{10}$$

The spacetime has a *causal structure* defined as follows. Let the initial conditions be $x(0) = x_0$ and $\xi(0) = \xi_0$. Then for a fixed x_0 and varying ξ_0 the tangent lines to the trajectories with $H(x_0, \xi_0) = 0$ define a *causal cone* $\mathcal{C}(x_0)$ at the point x_0 (usually called the light-cone). The causal cone separates M in two regions: the interior $\mathcal{I}(x_0)$ of the cone that can be called the *causal set* (consisting of the trajectories with $H(x_0, \xi_0) < 0$, so called time-like trajectories) and the exterior $\mathcal{E}(x_0)$ of the cone (*causally disconnected set*) (consisting of the trajectories with $H(x_0, \xi_0) > 0$ called the space-like trajectories), so that

$$M = \mathcal{I}(x_0) \cup \mathcal{C}(x_0) \cup \mathcal{E}(x_0)\,.$$

The points in the causal set are causally connected with the point x_0, i.e. they can be connected by time-like trajectories. The causal set is divided in two parts: the absolute past $\mathcal{I}^-(x_0)$, and the absolute future $\mathcal{I}^+(x_0)$ of the point x_0, i.e.

$$\mathcal{I}(x_0) = \mathcal{I}^-(x_0) \cup \mathcal{I}^+(x_0)\,.$$

The exterior of the cone is not causally connected with x_0.

The study of linear second-order partial differential equations (both elliptic and hyperbolic) simplifies significantly if one introduces the machinery of Riemannian geometry. The transformation law of the matrix a under diffeomorphisms enables us to identify it with a *Riemannian metric*

$$g^{\mu\nu} = a^{\mu\nu}, \qquad g_{\mu\nu} = (a^{\mu\nu})^{-1}\,, \tag{11}$$

where $(a^{\mu\nu})$ is the inverse matrix.

Then, one defines the canonical *Levi-Civita connection* (Christoffel symbols)

$$\Gamma^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}g^{\mu\gamma}\left(\partial_\beta g_{\gamma\alpha} + \partial_\alpha g_{\gamma\beta} - \partial_\gamma g_{\alpha\beta}\right)\,. \tag{12}$$

The Levi-Civita connection defines in a canonical way a connection on all bundles in the tensor algebra over the tangent TM and cotangent T^*M

bundles, i.e. covariant derivatives of tensors of all types. In particular, the Levi-Civita connection is the unique compatible torsion-free (symmetric) connection. In other words, the Christoffel symbols are the unique solution of the equations

$$\Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\beta\alpha} \tag{13}$$

$$\nabla_{\alpha} g_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\alpha} g_{\mu\nu} - \Gamma^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\alpha} g_{\lambda\nu} - \Gamma^{\lambda}{}_{\nu\alpha} g_{\mu\lambda} = 0\,. \tag{14}$$

The Hamiltonian system (10) is nothing but the equation of geodesics of the metric g. The geodesics lying on the surface $H(x_0, \xi_0) = 0$ are the null-geodesics that form exactly the light cone at x_0.

Finally, one defines the *Riemann curvature tensor*

$$R^{\mu}{}_{\nu\alpha\beta} = \partial_{\alpha}\Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\nu\beta} - \partial_{\beta}\Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\nu\alpha} + \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\lambda\alpha}\Gamma^{\lambda}{}_{\nu\beta} - \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\lambda\beta}\Gamma^{\lambda}{}_{\nu\alpha}\,, \tag{15}$$

the Ricci tensor

$$R_{\nu\beta} = R^{\mu}{}_{\nu\mu\beta}\,, \tag{16}$$

and the scalar curvature

$$R = g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{17}$$

It is worth mentioning that the metric can be defined purely algebraically. Since L is a second-order partial differential operator, for a scalar function S (which we view here as the operator of multiplication by the function S) the commutator

$$[L, S] = LS - SL \tag{18}$$

is a first-order differential operator, and the double commutator

$$[[L, S], S] = 2a^{\mu\nu}(\partial_{\mu} S)(\partial_{\nu} S) \tag{19}$$

is just a smooth function. Thus the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (7) can be written in the form

$$[[L, S], S] = 0\,. \tag{20}$$

This enables one to define the metric in terms of the commutators.

3 General Relativity

So far we were studying some matter field φ in a given background metric (a tensor field). The dynamics of the matter field can be described by the

matter action functional

$$S_{\mathrm{mat}}(\varphi, g) = \int\limits_{\Omega} dx\, \mathcal{L}(\varphi, g)\,, \tag{21}$$

where $dx = dx^0 \wedge dx^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{n-1}$ is the Lebesgue measure on M, $\mathcal{L}(\varphi, g)$ is the Lagrangian density and Ω is a region of the spacetime with a spacelike boundary $\partial\Omega$.

In general relativity one identifies the metric g with the gravitational field and studies the dynamics of the gravitational field itself by considering the Einstein-Hilbert action functional (with the cosmological constant)

$$S_{\mathrm{grav}}(g) = \int\limits_{\Omega} dx\, \sqrt{|g|}\, \frac{1}{16\pi G}\,(R - 2\Lambda) + \int\limits_{\partial\Omega} d\hat{x}\, \sqrt{|\hat{g}|}\frac{1}{8\pi G}\, K\,, \tag{22}$$

where $|g| = |\det g_{\mu\nu}|$, G is the Newtonian gravitational constant, Λ is the cosmological constant, $\hat{x}$ are the coordinates on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, $\hat{g}$ is the induced metric on the boundary and K is the extrinsic curvature of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Again, the surface term is written just for completeness, it will not play much role in the following. That is why we do not provide any more details on the definition of the induced metric, the extrinsic curvature etc. This is all standard material that can be found in standard references [1].

The standard variation procedure leads then to the matter field equations

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi} S_{\mathrm{mat}}(\varphi, g) = 0\,, \tag{23}$$

and the Einstein equations

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R + g_{\mu\nu}\Lambda = 8\pi G\, T_{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{24}$$

where

$$T^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{|g|}}\, \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} S_{\mathrm{mat}}(\varphi, g) \tag{25}$$

is the energy-momentum tensor. The action of general relativity is constructed in such a way that it is invariant under diffeomorphisms. This leads to the conservation of the energy-momentum in the usual way.

4 Origin of Matrix Riemannian Geometry

General relativity is constructed by using the following fundamental objects and concepts:

i) *Event* (a real n-tuple $(x^0, \cdots, x^{n-1})$),

ii) *Spacetime* (the set of all events),

iii) *Topology* of spacetime,

iv) *Manifold structure* of spacetime,

v) *Smooth differentiable structure* of spacetime,

vi) *Diffeomorphism group* invariance,

vii) *Causal structure* (global hyperbolicity),

viii) *Dimension* of spacetime (in low-energy physics $n = 4$),

ix) *(Pseudo)-Riemannian metric* with the signature $(- + \cdots +)$,

x) *Canonical connections* on spin-tensor bundles over the spacetime.

One can deform general relativity by changing the meaning of different aspects of this picture. The most radical is probably the approach of noncommutative geometry when one replaces the basic structures like events, spacetime etc. The most conservative approach is to change just the metric part without changing much of the above. Our approach is rather a conservative one since it just changes the least fundamental notions in the above.

The analysis of the previous sections clearly shows that the basic notions of general relativity are based on the geometrical interpretation of the hyperbolic wave equation that describe propagation of some fields *without the internal structure*, (in particular, light), that could transmit information in the spacetime. At the time of creation of general relativity the electromagnetic field was the only field that can be used for such purpose. This is still true for the macroscopic phenomena. However, at the microscopic distances this role of the electromagnetic field (photon) could be played by some other gauge fields (say, gluons and other vector bosons) that, together with the photon, form a multiplet of gauge fields *with some internal structure*. That

is why to repeat the Einstein analysis one has to consider a linear wave equation for such fields, i.e. instead of the scalar equation (2) we have a *system* of linear second-order hyperbolic (wave) partial differential equations. This would cardinally change the standard geometric interpretation of general relativity. Exactly in the same way as a scalar equation defines Riemannian geometry, a system of wave equations will generate a more general picture, that we call *Matrix Riemannian Geometry* (MRG).

4.1 Hyperbolic Systems

To be precise, let V be a smooth N-dimensional vector bundle over M, V^* be its dual and $\mathrm{End}\,(V) \simeq V \times V^*$ be the bundle of its smooth endomorphisms. Then the sections φ of the vector bundle V are represented locally by complex N-dimensional contravariant vectors $\varphi = \big(\varphi^A(x)\big)$, the dual vectors $\chi \in V^*$ are complex covariant N-vectors $\chi = (\chi_A(x))$ and the sections X of the endomorphism bundle $\mathrm{End}\,(V)$ are represented by $N \times N$ complex matrices $X = \big(X^A{}_B(x)\big)$.

We assume that the vector bundle V is equipped with a Hermitian fiber inner product that can be represented locally by

$$\langle \psi, \varphi \rangle = \overline{\psi^A} E_{AB} \varphi^B \,, \tag{26}$$

where the bar denotes the complex conjugation and the matrix $E = (E_{AB})$ defines the Hermitian metric, i.e. it satisfies the equation

$$\overline{E^T} = E \,, \tag{27}$$

where T denotes the matrix transposition. The Hermitian inner product provides a natural isomorphism between the bundles V and V^* by

$$\langle \psi, \varphi \rangle = \mathrm{tr}_V(\varphi \otimes \psi^*) \,, \tag{28}$$

where $\psi^* \in V^*$ is the section dual to ψ and tr_V is the fiber trace. Locally

$$\psi^*_A = \overline{\psi^B} E_{BA} = \overline{E_{AB} \psi^B} \,. \tag{29}$$

Similarly, we will also identify the bundles $(\mathrm{End}\,(V))^*$ and $\mathrm{End}\,(V)$ by

$$\langle \psi, X\varphi \rangle = \langle X^* \psi, \varphi \rangle \,, \tag{30}$$

so that

$$X^* = E^{-1}\overline{X^T}E\,. \tag{31}$$

Let φ, f be smooth sections of the bundle V and let us consider the equation

$$L\varphi = f \tag{32}$$

where $L : C^\infty(V) \to C^\infty(V)$ is a linear second-order partial differential operator of the form

$$L = a^{\mu\nu}(x)\partial_\mu\partial_\nu + b^\mu(x)\partial_\mu + c(x) \tag{33}$$

with *endomorphism-valued* smooth coefficients, i.e.

$$a^{\mu\nu} = \left(a^{\mu\nu\,A}{}_B(x)\right), \qquad b^\mu = \left(b^{\mu\,A}{}_B(x)\right), \qquad c = \left(c^A{}_B(x)\right). \tag{34}$$

As in the scalar case $a^{\mu\nu}$ must be symmetric in the vector indices

$$a^{\mu\nu} = a^{\nu\mu}\,. \tag{35}$$

Further, we assume that the operator L is formally self-adjoint with respect to the fiber inner product and some measure μ, which means that the components of the matrix a must be self-adjoint

$$(a^{\mu\nu})^* = a^{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{36}$$

There are also some conditions on the lower order coefficients b and c but they will play no role in the subsequent discussion.

Note that the matrix a transforms under diffeomorphisms as a contravariant matrix-valued two-tensor, (more precisely a section of the bundle $TM \otimes TM \otimes \mathrm{End}\,(V)$), i.e. exactly as in eq. (5). However, in the matrix case one cannot, in general, put the operator L in a form like (6) by choosing the coordinates. We can also consider the gauge transformations

$$\varphi(x) \longrightarrow U(x)\varphi(x)\,, \tag{37}$$

$$a^{\mu\nu}(x) \longrightarrow U(x)a^{\mu\nu}(x)U(x)^{-1}\,, \tag{38}$$

where $U(x)$ is a smooth nondegenerate matrix-valued function.

The leading symbol of this operator is

$$\sigma_L(L; x, \xi) = -H(x, \xi) \tag{39}$$

where $\xi \in T^*_x M$ is a cotangent vector and

$$H(x,\xi) = a^{\mu\nu}(x)\xi_\mu\xi_\nu\,. \tag{40}$$

Obviously, the matrix $H(x,\xi)$ is self-adjoint

$$H^* = H \tag{41}$$

and, therefore, has real eigenvalues. We will assume that its eigenvalues $h_i(x,\xi)$, $(i = 1,\ldots,s)$, are distinct or have constant multiplicities d_i.

It is clear that they are homogeneous functions of ξ of degree 2

$$h_i(x,\lambda\xi) = \lambda^2 h_i(x,\xi)\,. \tag{42}$$

Further, the eigenvalues are invariant under the gauge transformations (38) and transform under the diffeomorphisms as

$$h'_i(x',\xi) = h_i(x,\xi')\,, \tag{43}$$

where

$$\xi'_\mu = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\mu}\xi_\alpha\,. \tag{44}$$

The operator L is *elliptic* if for any $x \in M$ and any $\xi \neq 0$ the matrix $H(x,\xi)$ is nondegenerate, i.e.

$$\det{}_V H(x,\xi) \neq 0\,, \tag{45}$$

so that all eigenvalues $h_i(x,\xi)$ are non-zero.

The operator L is *(strictly) hyperbolic* at x in the direction $\nu \in T^*_x M$ if

$$\det{}_V H(x,\nu) = \det{}_V(a^{\mu\nu}(x)\nu_\mu\nu_\nu) \neq 0 \tag{46}$$

(i.e. the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}(x)\nu_\mu\nu_\nu$ is non-degenerate), and for any cotangent vector $\xi \neq 0$ not parallel to ν all the roots of the characteristic equation

$$\det{}_V H(x,\xi+\lambda\nu) = \det{}_V\left[\lambda^2 a^{\mu\nu}\nu_\mu\nu_\nu + 2\lambda a^{\mu\nu}\xi_\mu\nu_\nu + a^{\mu\nu}\xi_\mu\xi_\nu\right] = 0 \tag{47}$$

are real (and distinct); clearly there are $2N$ roots.

The same condition can be stated as follows: the operator L is (strictly) hyperbolic at x in the direction $\nu \in T^*_x M$ if

$$h_i(x,\nu) \neq 0\,, \qquad (i = 1,\ldots,s) \tag{48}$$

and for any cotangent vector $\xi \neq 0$ not parallel to ν each characteristic equation

$$h_i(x, \xi + \lambda\nu) = 0 \tag{49}$$

has exactly two real distinct roots $\lambda_i^{\pm}(x, \xi)$.

The cotangent vector $\nu(x)$ defines a smooth one-form on M and the roots of the characteristic equation are smooth functions on M. Let us denote $\omega^0 = \nu$ and choose $\omega^1, \ldots, \omega^{n-1} \in T^*M$ so that ω^a, $(a = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1)$, is a basis in the cotangent bundle. Then the operator L is *(strictly) hyperbolic* if at any $x \in M$ none of the one-forms $\omega^1, \ldots, \omega^{n-1}$ defines a hyperbolic direction.

The system of hyperbolic partial differential equation describes the propagation of a *collection of waves*. Similarly to the scalar case the operator L generates the causal structure on the manifold M as follows. First, we define the characteristics of the matrix hyperbolic operator L. The Hamilton-Jacobi equations and the Hamilton equations have the form

$$\det{}_V[H(x, \partial S)] = \det{}_V\left[a^{\mu\nu}(x)(\partial_\mu S)(\partial_\nu S)\right] = 0\,, \tag{50}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx^\mu}{dt} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_\mu} \det{}_V[H(x, \xi)] \\ &= 2 \operatorname{tr}_V\left[K(x, \xi) a^{\mu\nu}(x)\right] \xi_\nu \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\xi_\mu}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \det{}_V[H(x, \xi)] \\ &= -\operatorname{tr}_V\left[K(x, \xi)\partial_\mu a^{\alpha\beta}(x)\right] \xi_\alpha \xi_\beta \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where

$$K(x, \xi) = \det{}_V[H(x, \xi)] H^{-1}(x, \xi)\,. \tag{53}$$

Note that $K(x, \xi)$ is polynomial in the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$.

The Hamilton-Jacobi equation (50) has then as many solutions as the number of eigenvalues. Each eigenvalue defines a Hamiltonian system of its own, i.e. a Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$h_i(x, \partial S) = 0\,, \tag{54}$$

and Hamilton equations

$$\frac{dx^\mu}{dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_\mu} h_i(x, \xi) \tag{55}$$

$$\frac{d\xi_\mu}{dt} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} h_i(x, \xi) \tag{56}$$

These equations define different trajectories for each eigenvalue. These trajectories can be identified with the geodesics of some Riemannian metrics. The trajectories with tangents on the surface $\det{}_V H(x_0, \xi_0) = 0$ are the null trajectories and define the causal cones. In general, they are different. So, instead of a unique cone one gets s causal cones $\mathcal{C}_i(x_0)$ (recall that s is the number of different eigenvalues of $H(x, \xi)$). Each cone defines a causal set $\mathcal{I}_i(x_0)$ consisting of the absolute past $\mathcal{I}_i^-(x_0)$ and the absolute future $\mathcal{I}_i^+(x_0)$ as well as the exterior of the cone $\mathcal{E}_i(x_0)$. Since the points in all causal sets are causally connected with the point x_0, i.e. there is at least one time-like trajectory connecting those points with x_0, we define the *causal set* as the union of all causal sets

$$\mathcal{I}(x_0) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \mathcal{I}_i(x_0)\,, \tag{57}$$

similarly for the absolute past and the absolute future

$$\mathcal{I}^{\pm}(x_0) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \mathcal{I}_i^{\pm}(x_0)\,, \tag{58}$$

The *causally disconnected set* is defined as the intersection of the exteriors of all causal cones

$$\mathcal{E}(x_0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{s} \mathcal{E}_i(x_0)\,. \tag{59}$$

With these definition we have the standard causal decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \mathcal{I}(x_0) \cup \partial\mathcal{I}(x_0) \cup \mathcal{E}(x_0) \\ &= \mathcal{I}^-(x_0) \cup \mathcal{I}^+(x_0) \cup \partial\mathcal{I}(x_0) \cup \mathcal{E}(x_0)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Since the causal cones vary from point to point, the structure of the causal set is different at different points. Such a picture can be interpreted as a "*fuzzy light-cone*."

We see that in the matrix case the operator L does not define a unique Riemannian metric. Rather there is a matrix-valued symmetric 2-tensor field $a^{\mu\nu}$. We can decompose it according to

$$a^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu}\mathbb{I} + \kappa\phi^{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{61}$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity endomorphism, κ is a deformation parameter,

$$g^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V\, a^{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{62}$$

and $\phi^{\mu\nu}$ is the trace-free part

$$\mathrm{tr}_V \phi^{\mu\nu} = 0\,, \tag{63}$$

so that the matrix $H(x,\xi)$ becomes

$$H(x,\xi) = \mathbb{I}\, g^{\mu\nu}(x)\xi_\mu\xi_\nu + \kappa\phi^{\mu\nu}(x)\xi_\mu\xi_\nu\,. \tag{64}$$

We can also introduce the whole family of $2k$-tensors

$$g^{\mu_1\nu_1\cdots\mu_k\nu_k} = \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V a^{\mu_1\nu_1}\cdots a^{\mu_k\nu_k}\,, \tag{65}$$

which contain the information about the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$. Similarly, the information about the eigenvalues of the matrix $H(x,\xi)$ is encoded in the traces

$$\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V H^k(x,\xi) = g^{\mu_1\nu_1\cdots\mu_k\nu_k}(x)\xi_{\mu_1}\xi_{\nu_1}\cdots\xi_{\mu_k}\xi_{\nu_k} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{s} d_i h_i^k(x,\xi)\,. \tag{66}$$

This can be easily evaluated as a power series in the deformation parameter

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V H^j(x,\xi) &= (g^{\mu\nu}\xi_\mu\xi_\nu)^j \\ &+\frac{j(j-1)}{2}\kappa^2(g^{\mu\nu}\xi_\mu\xi_\nu)^{j-2}\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V(\phi^{\mu\nu}\phi^{\alpha\beta})\xi_\mu\xi_\nu\xi_\alpha\xi_\beta + O(\kappa^3)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

It is worth noting that, in general, the matrix $g^{\mu\nu}$ is not necessarily invertible, even in the elliptic case. Although in the weak deformation limit, i.e. $\kappa \to 0$, it must be nondegenerate, it is not necessarily so in the strongly deformed theory for large κ. Thus, the matrix $g^{\mu\nu}$ which plays the role of Riemannian metric in the commutative limit loses this role in fully noncommutative theory and can be singular or even zero.

5 Deforming General Relativity

Gravity will be described by new dynamical variable $a^{\mu\nu}$. Our final goal is to construct a diffeomorphism-invariant functional $S(a)$ from the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$ and its first derivatives. Notice also that $g^{\mu\nu}$, in fact all tensors $g^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_{2k}}$, do not change under the gauge transformation (38). Our main idea is to promote this symmetry to a *universal local gauge symmetry*.

That is why we need an invariant action functional of this field

$$S_{\mathrm{matr-grav}}(a) = \int\limits_{\Omega} dx\, \mathcal{L}(a, \partial a)\,, \tag{68}$$

where $\mathcal{L}(a, \partial a)$ is the Lagrangian density. This functional should be invariant under both the gauge group as well as the group of diffeomorphisms. In infinitesimal form these transformations read

$$\delta_\omega a^{\mu\nu} = [\omega, a^{\mu\nu}]\,, \tag{69}$$

$$\delta_\xi a^{\mu\nu} = \xi^\lambda \partial_\lambda a^{\mu\nu} - a^{\mu\lambda}\partial_\lambda \xi^\nu - a^{\nu\lambda}\partial_\lambda \xi^\mu\,, \tag{70}$$

where ω is an element of the algebra of the gauge group

$$\delta_\omega U = \omega \tag{71}$$

and ξ is the infinitesimal coordinate transformation

$$\delta_\xi x^\mu = -\xi^\mu(x)\,. \tag{72}$$

The action for the matrix gravity should reduce to the standard Einstein-Hilbert functional (22) in the commutative limit $\kappa \to 0$ (or when $\phi^{\mu\nu} = 0$).

First of all, we need a measure, i.e. a density $\mu(a)$ that does not depend on the derivatives of a and transforms under diffeomorphisms like

$$\mu'(x') = \mu(x) J(x)\,, \qquad dx'\,\mu'(x') = dx\,\mu(x)\,, \tag{73}$$

where

$$J(x) = \det\left[\frac{\partial x'^\mu(x)}{\partial x^\alpha}\right]\,, \tag{74}$$

or, in infinitesimal form,

$$\delta_\omega \mu = 0, \qquad \delta_\xi \mu = \xi^\alpha \partial_\alpha \mu + \mu \partial_\alpha \xi^\alpha = \partial_\alpha(\mu \xi^\alpha)\,. \tag{75}$$

As a guiding principle we will require the correct commutative limit

$$\mu = \sqrt{|g|} + O(\kappa)\,, \tag{76}$$

where $|g| = (\sigma \det g^{\mu\nu})^{-1}$ and $\sigma = 1$ in the elliptic case and $\sigma = -1$ in the hyperbolic case so that $\mu > 0$.

We can construct a good candidate for the measure as follows. Let $F(x,\xi)$ be a scalar function constructed from the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}(x)$ and ξ that is invariant under gauge transformations and transforms under diffeomorphisms like

$$F'(x',\xi) = F(x,\xi')\,, \tag{77}$$

where

$$\xi'_\mu = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\mu}\xi_\alpha\,. \tag{78}$$

For example, we can define

$$F(x,\xi) = \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{tr}_V \Phi(H(x,\xi)) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{s} d_j \Phi(h_j(x,\xi))\,, \tag{79}$$

where Φ is a positive function of single variable such that it decreases sufficiently fast as $\xi \to \infty$. Then the function

$$\mu(x) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\xi\, F(x,\xi) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\xi\, \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{tr}_V \Phi(H(x,\xi)) \tag{80}$$

transform as (73) and can serve as measure. The choice of the function Φ should guarantee the convergence of this integral. Note that this choice is obviously not unique.

We can write the measure in the form

$$\mu = \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{tr}_V \rho\,, \tag{81}$$

where ρ is a matrix-valued function that transforms like density, i.e.

$$\rho'(x') = \rho(x) J(x)\,. \tag{82}$$

For example, ρ can be defined by

$$\rho(x) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\xi\, \Phi(x,\xi)\,. \tag{83}$$

Another good candidate for the measure can be obtained as follows. Let

$$\psi = \frac{1}{n!}\varepsilon_{\mu_1\dots\mu_n}\varepsilon_{\nu_1\dots\nu_n} a^{\mu_1\nu_1}\cdots a^{\mu_n\nu_n}\,, \tag{84}$$

where ε is the standard completely antisymmetric Levi-Civita symbol. By using the symmetry properties of the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$, (35), (36), one can prove that the matrix ψ is self-adjoint

$$\psi^* = \psi. \tag{85}$$

We will require that this matrix is nondegenerate. Then the matrix $\psi^*\psi$ is positive definite so that we can define ρ by

$$\rho = (\psi^*\psi)^{-1/4}\,. \tag{86}$$

Obviously, the matrix ρ is self-adjoint, $\rho^* = \rho$, and positive definite, $\rho > 0$, so that the measure is positive $\mu > 0$.

In the commutative limit both of the above definitions lead to the same Riemannian measure (76). In the weak deformation limit we obtain

$$\mu = \sqrt{|g|}\left\{1 + \kappa^2 \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V(\phi^{\mu\nu}\phi^{\alpha\beta})(c_1 g_{\mu\alpha}g_{\nu\beta} + c_2 g_{\mu\nu}g_{\alpha\beta}) + O(\kappa^3)\right\}\,, \tag{87}$$

where $g_{\mu\nu} = (g^{\mu\nu})^{-1}$ is the inverse matrix and c_1 and c_2 are some constants depending on the choice of the measure.

Thus we obtain the simplest zero order term in the action

$$\begin{aligned} S_0(a) &= -\frac{\Lambda}{8\pi G}\int\limits_\Omega dx\,\mu(x) \\ &= -\frac{\Lambda}{8\pi G}\int\limits_\Omega dx\,\sqrt{|g|}\Big\{1 + \kappa^2 \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V(\phi^{\mu\nu}\phi^{\alpha\beta})(c_1 g_{\mu\alpha}g_{\nu\beta} + c_2 g_{\mu\nu}g_{\alpha\beta}) \\ &\quad + O(\kappa^3)\Big\}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

where Λ is the 'cosmological constant' and G is the gravitational constant. This functional is obviouly invariant under both the gauge transformations and the diffeomorphisms.

The dynamical functional $S_1(a)$ must depend on the first derivatives of a. Assuming that it is local, it must be quadratic in the first derivatives and non-polynomial in a, i.e.

$$S_1(a) = \frac{1}{16\pi G}\int\limits_\Omega dx\,P^{\mu\nu}{}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}{}^{A}{}_{B}{}^{C}{}_{D}\partial_\mu a^{\alpha\beta B}{}_{A}\partial_\nu a^{\gamma\delta D}{}_{C}\,, \tag{89}$$

where P depends only on a but not on its derivatives. This can also be written as a sum of the terms like

$$S_1(a) = \frac{1}{16\pi G}\int\limits_{\Omega} dx\, \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V \sum P(a)(\partial a)Q(a)(\partial a)\,. \tag{90}$$

We see that our functional is reduced to nothing else but a *generalized nonlinear sigma model*. In principle, one can find the form of the object P by studying the condition of diffeomorphism invariance in the perturbation theory in the deformation parameter κ. Alternatively, which should be much easier, one can define tensors built from the matrix a and use them to construct the invariants.

The total action in perturbation theory should have the form

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathrm{matr-grav}}(a) \;=\; & \frac{1}{16\pi G}\int\limits_{\Omega} dx\sqrt{|g|}\Big\{(R-2\Lambda) \\ & +\kappa^2\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V\Big[(\nabla_\gamma\phi^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\delta\phi^{\alpha\beta})F^{\gamma\delta}{}_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \\ & +(\phi^{\mu\nu}\phi^{\alpha\beta})\left(R^{\rho\sigma\kappa\lambda}W_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta\rho\sigma\kappa\lambda}+\Lambda V_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\right)\Big]+O(\kappa^3)\Big\}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

where $R^{\rho\sigma\kappa\lambda}$ is the curvature of the metric g, R is the scalar curvature, ∇ denotes the standard covariant derivative with the canonical symmetric connection compatible with the metric g, and F, W and V are tensors constructed polynomially from the metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $g^{\alpha\beta}$, and the Kronecker symbol.

Therefore, in the weak deformation limit our model describes general relativity and a multiplet of massive tensor fields of spin 2 with mass parameters of order Λ in unbroken phase. Depending on the potential terms there could be also massles fields as well as spontaneous symmetry breaking. This question requires further study.

5.1 Matrix Geometry

The Riemannian metric is nothing but the metric on the tangent bundle and general relativity is the dynamical theory of that metric. It can also be considered as an isomorphism between the tangent and cotangent bundles. Similarly, the quantity $a^{\mu\nu}$ introduced in the previous section is an example of such an isomorphism of other bundles and our main idea is to develop a dynamical theory of such isomorphisms.

Let us consider the bundle $\mathrm{Iso}\,(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T}^*) \simeq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T})$ of linear isomorphisms of the bundle $\mathcal{T} = TM \otimes V$ onto the bundle $\mathcal{T}^* = T^*M \otimes V$, where TM and T^*M are the tangent and cotangent bundles and V is a vector bundle over M. The bundle V is not of the spin-tensor type since it is supposed to describe some internal structure of matter fields versus external one described by the spin-tensor bundles. The isomorphisms $B : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}^*$ can be identified with the sections of the bundle $T^*M \otimes T^*M \otimes \mathrm{End}\,(V)$ and and the isomorphisms $A : \mathcal{T}^* \to \mathcal{T}$ with the section of the bundle $TM \otimes TM \otimes \mathrm{End}\,(V)$.

For $a \in TM \otimes TM \otimes \mathrm{End}\,(V)$ to define an isomorphism, the equation

$$a^{\mu\nu}\varphi_\nu = \psi^\mu \tag{92}$$

with any given $\psi \in T^*M \otimes V$, must have a unique solution

$$\varphi_\nu = b_{\nu\mu}\psi^\mu\,. \tag{93}$$

In other words, there must exist a unique solution, $b \in T^*M \otimes T^*M \otimes \mathrm{End}\,(V)$, to the equations

$$a^{\mu\nu}b_{\nu\lambda} = b_{\mu\nu}a^{\nu\lambda} = \delta^\mu_\lambda \mathbb{I}\,. \tag{94}$$

This can be put in another form. Let $e_i \in T^*M \otimes V$ be the basis in the space of one forms valued in V. Then the equation (94) has a unique solution if and only if the bilinear form $A_{ij} = \langle e_j, Ae_i\rangle$ is nondegenerate, i.e. $\det A_{ij} \neq 0$.

Three remarks are in order here. First, assuming the nondegeneracy of the tensor $g^{\mu\nu}$ one can obtain the solution of the equation (94) in form of a power series in the deformation parameter

$$b_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}\mathbb{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^n\kappa^n g_{\mu\alpha_1}\phi^{\alpha_1\beta_1}g_{\beta_1\alpha_2}\phi^{\alpha_2\beta_2}\cdots g_{\beta_{n-1}\alpha_n}\phi^{\alpha_n\beta_n}g_{\beta_n\nu}\,, \tag{95}$$

which converges for small κ. Second, even if the matrix $g^{\mu\nu}$ is degenerate (or even zero) the matrix $b_{\mu\nu}$ might still be well defined, which would correspond to the limit $\kappa \to \infty$. Third, one can easily show that the matrix $b_{\mu\nu}$ satisfies the equation

$$b^*_{\mu\nu} = b_{\nu\mu}\,, \tag{96}$$

but is not necessarily a self-adjoint matrix symmetric in tensor indices, more precisely,

$$b^*_{\mu\nu} \neq b_{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad b_{\mu\nu} \neq b_{\nu\mu}\,. \tag{97}$$

In that sense the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$ is nicer since it has additional properties (35), (36).

That is why, one can use the matrices $a^{\mu\nu}$ and $b_{\mu\nu}$ to raise and lower tensor indices in the same way as the metric tensor. One must be careful however, since the matrix $b_{\mu\nu}$ is not symmetric and the matrices $a^{\mu\nu}$ and $b_{\mu\nu}$ do not commute for different indices. In particular,

$$a^{\nu\mu}b_{\alpha\mu}\varphi^{\alpha} \neq \varphi^{\nu}\,, \qquad b_{\mu\alpha}a^{\mu\nu}\varphi_{\nu} \neq \varphi_{\alpha}\,, \tag{98}$$

$$a^{\mu\alpha}a^{\nu\beta}T_{\alpha\beta} \neq a^{\nu\beta}a^{\mu\alpha}T_{\alpha\beta}\,, \qquad a^{\mu\beta}b_{\nu\alpha}T^{\alpha}{}_{\beta} \neq b_{\nu\alpha}a^{\mu\beta}T^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\,. \tag{99}$$

The equations (94) have important implications for the derivatives

$$a^{\alpha\beta}\partial_{\mu}b_{\beta\lambda} = -\partial_{\mu}a^{\alpha\beta}b_{\beta\lambda}\,, \qquad b_{\alpha\beta}\partial_{\mu}a^{\beta\lambda} = -\partial_{\mu}b_{\alpha\beta}a^{\beta\lambda}\,, \tag{100}$$

and, therefore,

$$\partial_{\mu}b_{\alpha\beta} = -b_{\alpha\gamma}\partial_{\mu}a^{\gamma\delta}b_{\delta\beta}\,, \qquad \partial_{\mu}a^{\alpha\beta} = -a^{\alpha\gamma}\partial_{\mu}b_{\gamma\delta}a^{\delta\beta}\,. \tag{101}$$

Now we introduce matrix-valued coefficients $\mathcal{A}^{\mu}{}_{\alpha\beta}$ that transform like the connection coefficients under the diffeomorphisms, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}'^{\mu'}{}_{\alpha'\beta'}(x') = \frac{\partial x'^{\mu}}{\partial x^{\nu}}\frac{\partial x^{\gamma}}{\partial x'^{\alpha}}\frac{\partial x^{\delta}}{\partial x'^{\beta}}\mathcal{A}^{\nu}{}_{\gamma\delta}(x) + \frac{\partial x'^{\mu}}{\partial x^{\nu}}\frac{\partial^2 x^{\nu}}{\partial x'^{\alpha}\partial x'^{\beta}}\mathbb{I}\,. \tag{102}$$

Let T^p_q be the tensor bundle of type (p,q). We define a linear map

$$\mathcal{D} : T^p_q \otimes V \to T^p_{q+1} \otimes V \tag{103}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{D}\varphi)^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_p}_{\alpha\nu_1\ldots\nu_q} &= \partial_{\alpha}\varphi^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_p}_{\nu_1\ldots\nu_q} + \sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathcal{A}^{\mu_j}{}_{\lambda\alpha}\varphi^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_{j-1}\lambda\mu_{j+1}\ldots\mu_p}_{\nu_1\ldots\nu_q} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{q}\mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\nu_i\alpha}\varphi^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_p}_{\nu_1\ldots\nu_{i-1}\lambda\nu_{i+1}\ldots\nu_q}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

This map is well defined as an operator between the tensor bundles valued in V.

Now it is not difficult to construct the matrix curvature and the matrix torsion. For a $\varphi \in T^*M \otimes V$ we compute

$$(\mathcal{D}^2\varphi)_{\mu\nu\alpha} - (\mathcal{D}^2\varphi)_{\nu\mu\alpha} = -\mathcal{R}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu\nu}\varphi_{\lambda} + \mathcal{T}^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{D}\varphi)_{\lambda\alpha}\,, \tag{105}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\nu} - \partial_\nu \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu} + \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\beta\mu}\mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\nu} - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\beta\nu}\mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\mu}\,, \tag{106}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\nu\mu}\,. \tag{107}$$

Next, we can define the matrix Ricci tensor

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{R}^{\alpha}{}_{\mu\alpha\nu} \tag{108}$$

and, by using the tensor $a^{\mu\nu}$, even a matrix-valued scalar curvature

$$\mathcal{R} = a^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{109}$$

Note though, that because of the noncommutativity the definition of the scalar is not unique .

Now we need to fix the connection, i.e. to relate it somehow to the tensor a. To fix the connection we should impose an *invariant compatibility condition*. We will impose the compatibility condition in the form

$$\partial_\mu a^{\alpha\beta} + \mathcal{A}^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu}a^{\lambda\beta} + \mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\lambda\mu}a^{\alpha\lambda} = 0\,. \tag{110}$$

The solution of this equation is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} = \frac{1}{2}b_{\lambda\sigma}\Big(&a^{\alpha\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\rho\sigma} - a^{\rho\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\sigma\alpha} - a^{\sigma\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\alpha\rho} \\ &+S^{\alpha\rho\sigma} + S^{\rho\sigma\alpha} + S^{\sigma\rho\alpha}\Big)b_{\rho\mu}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

where S is an arbitrary matrix valued tensor satisfying the symmetry condition

$$S^{\alpha\rho\sigma} = -S^{\alpha\sigma\rho}\,. \tag{112}$$

In general, this connection is not symmetric. In the commutative limit it reduces to

$$\mathcal{A}^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} = \Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu}\mathbb{I} + \frac{1}{2}\left(S^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} + S_{\mu\lambda}{}^{\alpha} + S_{\lambda\mu}{}^{\alpha}\right) + O(\kappa)\,, \tag{113}$$

where $\Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu}$ are the Christoffel coefficients of the metric $g^{\mu\nu}$ and the indices of the tensor S are lowered with the metric g. Therefore, the torsion is reduced to the tensor S, i.e.

$$\mathcal{T}^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} = S^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} + O(\kappa)\,. \tag{114}$$

So, to have the torsion-free theory we have to set $S = 0$. However, in the noncommutative case the connection is not symmetric even if $S = 0$.

It turns out that the compatibility condition of the form

$$\partial_\mu b_{\alpha\beta} - \mathcal{A}^\lambda{}_{\alpha\mu} b_{\lambda\beta} - \mathcal{A}^\lambda{}_{\beta\mu} b_{\alpha\lambda} = 0\,, \tag{115}$$

which looks simpler on a first glance, is, in fact, more complicated. Because the matrix $b_{\mu\nu}$ is not symmetric this equation cannot be solved in a closed form. For example, the solution of this equation does *not* have the familiar form of Christoffel coefficients

$$\mathcal{A}^\lambda{}_{\alpha\beta} \neq \frac{1}{2}\left(\partial_\alpha b_{\beta\mu} + \partial_\beta b_{\alpha\mu} - \partial_\mu b_{\alpha\beta}\right) a^{\lambda\mu}\,. \tag{116}$$

The equation (115) can be solved only within the perturbation theory in the deformation parameter. We could also have used the symmetric part of the matrix b, i.e. $b_{(\mu\nu)}$, but the the inverse matrix would not be symmetric, so this does not simplify the solution after all.

6 A Model of Matrix Gravity

By using the matrix curvature we can now construct a simple generalization of the standard Einstein-Hilbert functional (with cosmological constant). We define

$$S_{\mathrm{matr-grav}}(a) = \int\limits_\Omega dx\, \frac{1}{16\pi G}\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V \rho\left(a^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}^\alpha{}_{\mu\alpha\nu} - 2\Lambda\right)\,. \tag{117}$$

This functional is obviously invariant under global gauge transformations

$$a(x) \to U a(x) U^{-1}\,. \tag{118}$$

One can easily make it local gauge symmetry by introducing a Yang-Mills field $\mathcal{B}$ valued in $\mathrm{End}\,(V)$ and replacing the partial derivatives in the definition of the connection coefficients and the curvature by covariant derivatives

$$\partial_\mu \to \partial_\mu + [\mathcal{B}_\mu,\ \cdot\ ]\,. \tag{119}$$

Thus we finally obtain an invariant action functional

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathrm{matr-grav}}(a,\mathcal{B}) \;&=\; \int\limits_\Omega dx\, \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V \rho\Big\{\frac{1}{16\pi G}\left(a^{\nu\mu}\mathcal{R}^\alpha{}_{\mu\alpha\nu} - 2\Lambda\right) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2e^2} a^{\nu\mu}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\alpha} a^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{F}_{\beta\nu}\Big\}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

where e is the Yang-Mills coupling constant, ρ is defined by eq. (83) or (86)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\nu} + [\mathcal{B}_\mu, \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\nu}] - \partial_\nu \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu} - [\mathcal{B}_\nu, \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu}] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\beta\mu}\mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\nu} - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\beta\nu}\mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\mu} \end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} &= b_{\lambda\sigma}\Big\{\frac{1}{2}\Big[a^{\alpha\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\rho\sigma} + a^{\alpha\gamma}[\mathcal{B}_\gamma, a^{\rho\sigma}] \\ &\quad - a^{\rho\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\sigma\alpha} - a^{\rho\gamma}[\mathcal{B}_\gamma, a^{\sigma\alpha}] - a^{\sigma\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\alpha\rho} - a^{\sigma\gamma}[\mathcal{B}_\gamma, a^{\alpha\rho}]\Big] \\ &\quad + S^{\alpha\rho\sigma} + S^{\rho\sigma\alpha} - S^{\sigma\alpha\rho}\Big\} b_{\rho\mu}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \mathcal{B}_\nu - \partial_\nu \mathcal{B}_\mu + [\mathcal{B}_\mu, \mathcal{B}_\nu]\,. \tag{123}$$

We should also impose an additional constraint on the tensor S, for example, just put it to zero, $S = 0$, since it is not a dynamical degree of freedom.

This functional describes the dynamics of the 'matrix metric field' a and the Yang-Mills field $\mathcal{B}$. It is invariant under the diffeomorphisms

$$x \to x' = x'(x) \tag{124}$$

and the local gauge transformations

$$a(x) \to U(x)a(x)U^{-1}(x) \tag{125}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_\mu(x) \to U(x)\mathcal{B}_\mu(x)U^{-1}(x) - (\partial_\mu U(x))U^{-1}(x)\,. \tag{126}$$

We could assume that the gauge group is a Lie group G, say a compact simple Lie group like $SU(N)$, that $\mathcal{B}$ takes values in the adjoint representation of the Lie algebra of G and a takes values in the enveloping algebra generated by the Lie algebra. In the commutative limit this reduces to the standard Yang-Mills fields coupled to gravity.

Now we need to introduce interaction of the fields a and $\mathcal{B}$ with matter fields in such a way that will lead to the spontaneous breakdown of the gauge symmetry, so that in the broken phase in the vacuum there is just one tensor field, which is identified with the metric of the space-time. All other tensor fields must have zero vacuum expectation values. In the unbroken phase there will not be a metric at all in the usual sense since there is no preferred tensor field with non-zero vacuum expectation value. Alternatively,

one could expect the gauge (grav-color) degrees of freedom to be confined within the Planck scales, so that only the invariants (grav-white states) are visible at large distances. For example, at large distances one could only see the diagonal part $g^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V\, a^{\mu\nu}$, which defines the metric of the spacetime at large distances and the gauge invariants like $\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V \mathcal{R}^{\mu}{}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$, etc., which determine in some sense the curvature of the spacetime.

One should stress that this model is a realization of a *consistent interaction of tensor fields with gravity*, which usually constitutes a problem. Notice that this model is, in fact, nothing but a generalized sigma model. So, the problems in quantization of this model are the same as in the quantization of the sigma model.

7 Conclusion

A careful analysis shows that the origin of Riemannian geometry in general relativity lies in the theory of the wave equations. We propose to replace a single wave equation by a system of wave equations at small distances. This brings completely new geometrical picture in the theory of gravitational phenomena. Instead of one Riemannian metric we have now a matrix-valued tensor field $a^{\mu\nu}$, which is the main dynamical field describing gravity. We also introduced a new gauge symmetry which is responsible for mixing the new degrees of freedom and a new Yang-Mills field $\mathcal{B}_\mu$. We constructed a second order action functional that describes the dynamics of the fields a and $\mathcal{B}$ and is invariant under the diffeomorphism and the new gauge transformations. This functional may be viewed as a "noncommutative deformation" of Einstein gravity coupled to a Yang-Mills model. We introduce a deformation parameter κ such that the theory has a "commutative limit" $\kappa \to 0$. In the weak deformation limit our model describes Einstein gravity, Yang-Mills fields, and a multiplet of self-interacting two-tensor fields that interact also with gravity and the Yang-Mills fields. We speculate that the new degrees of freedom could only be visible at Planckian scales, so that they do not exhibit themselves in the low-energy physics. However, the behavior of our model at higher energies should be radically different from the Einstein gravity since there is no preferred metric in the unbroken phase, when the new gauge symmetry is intact. It would be very interesting problem to study simple solutions of this model, say a static spherically symmetric solution, which would describe a "non-commutative black hole". There are reasons to

believe that this model could be free from singularities.

Of course, before one can take the matrix gravity seriously various important (and interesting) questions have to be clarified, in particular: *i)* classical (commutative) limit, *ii)* quantization, *iii)* semiclassical approximation, *iv)* renormalization, *v)* spontaneous symmetry breaking, and, finally, *vi)* Planck confinement.

We would like to make a couple of final remarks. First of all, to study this model in the one-loop approximation would require new methods since the partial differential operators involved will not be of the so-called Laplace type, i.e. they will not have the scalar leading symbol. Most of the calculations in quantum field theory were restricted so far to the Laplace type operators for which nice theory of heat kernel asymptotics is available. However, the study of heat kernel asymptotics for non-Laplace type operators is quite new and the methodology is still underdeveloped. For example, even the first heat kernel coefficients (A_0, A_1 and A_2) needed for the renormalization in four dimensions are not known in general. For some progress in this area (the calculation of A_1) see [10, 11].

Instead of the second-order operator L we could start from a first-order operator. Let D be a first order formally self-adjoint partial differential operator

$$D = \alpha^\mu(x)\partial_\mu + \beta(x)\,, \tag{127}$$

where α is an anti-self-adjoint

$$(\alpha^\mu)^* = -\alpha^\mu$$

smooth matrix-valued vector field and β is a matrix valued scalar field, acting on the smooth sections of the vector bundle V. The square of this operator defines a second-order operator

$$L = D^2 = a^{\mu\nu}(x)\partial_\mu\partial_\nu + b^\mu(x)\partial_\mu + c(x) \tag{128}$$

with

$$\alpha^\mu\alpha^\nu + \alpha^\nu\alpha^\mu = 2a^{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{129}$$

We stress here once again that we do not assume that $a^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu}\mathbb{I}$ or even $a^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu}E$ with some automorphism E. This enables one to repeat the whole construction in such a way that the dynamical variables of gravity will be the generalized 'Dirac matrices' α^μ instead of $a^{\mu\nu}$.

Another possibility is, following the approach of [5, 6, 7], to extend our model to the spaces where the coordinates do not commute, which is achieved by replacing the usual products by the (noncummutative) star (Moyal) product

$$f(x) \star g(x) = \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}\theta^{\mu\nu}\frac{\partial}{\partial u^{\mu}}\frac{\partial}{\partial v^{\nu}}\right) f(x+u)g(x+v)\Big|_{u=v=0}, \qquad (130)$$

where θ is an antisymmetric tensor.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Giampiero Esposito for stimulating discussions. The financial support by the University of Naples and the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare is gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (San Francisco: Freeman, 1973)

[2] J. Polchinski, *String Theory*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

[3] A. Konechny and A. Schwarz, *Introduction to M(atrix) theory and noncommutative geometry*, Phys. Repts. **360** (2002) 353–465

[4] C. Rovelli, *Loop Quantum Gravity*, Living Rev. Rel. **1** (1998) 1, gr-qc/9710008

[5] A. H. Chamseddine, G. Felder, J. Fröhlich, *Gravity in Non-Commutative Geometry*, Commun. Math. Phys. 155 (1993) 205–218

[6] A. H. Chamseddine, *Noncommutativity Gravity*, hep-th/0301112

[7] A. H. Chamseddine, *An Invariant Action for Noncommutative Gravity in Four-Dimensions*, J. Math. Phys. **44** (2003) 2534-2541

[8] J. Madore and J. Mourad, *A noncommutative extension of gravity*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **3** (1994) 221–224

[9] R. M. Wald, *A new type of gauge invariance for a collection of massless spin-2 fields: II. Geometrical interpretation*, Class. Quantum Grav. **4** (1987) 1279–1316

[10] I. G. Avramidi and T. Branson, *Heat kernel asymptotics of operators with non-Laplace principal part*, Rev. Math. Phys. **13** (2001) 847–890

[11] I. G. Avramidi and T. Branson, *A discrete leading symbol and spectral asymptotics for natural differential operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **190** (2002) 292–337